

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

-

-

WRIT PETITION No.3217 of 2007

-

-

Date: 20.02.2007

-

Between:

1. Dr.Koppaka Suryanarayana, S/o.late Subba Rao.
2. Smt.Koppaka Kanaka Susheela, W/o.Dr.Suryanarayana..

....Petitioners

and

1. The Government of A.P., rep.by its Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Sub-Registrar, Madhurawada, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District.

....Respondents

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

-
-
WRIT PETITION No.3217 of 2007
-

-
ORDER:

The petitioners state that they are the owners and possessors of the land admeasuring 266.66 Sq.yards in Plot No.20 in Survey No.48/3 as per VUDA approved lay out plan No.11/93 of Pothina Malayyapalem Village and an extent of land admeasuring 266.66 sq. yards in Plot no.3 in Survey No.48/3 as per VUDA approved pal No.11/93 of Pothina Malayyapalem Village and that they intended to sell the said property and entered into an agreement of sale with the intending purchaser. According to them, the agreement of sale executed by him was presented to the second respondent, for registration. The grievance of the petitioners is that the second respondent is not accepting the document for registration, on the ground that the Government issued a notification under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 (for short 'the Act'), in respect of the land in the said survey number. This writ petition is filed seeking appropriate directions to the second respondent in this regard.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Revenue.

Section 22-A of the Act empowered the Government to

issue notifications almost preventing the registration of documents in respect of the lands to be mentioned therein. Such a power was held to be *ultra vires* and the provision was struck down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Rajasthan v. Basanth Nahata***^[1].

Once the sole basis for the second respondent to refuse registration had disappeared, he is under obligation to receive the documents and consider the same in accordance with the provisions of the Stamp Act and the Registration Act.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the second respondent to receive and process the document presented by the petitioners and take necessary steps in accordance with the provisions of the Stamp Act and the Registration Act, within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

L.NARASIMHA REDDY, J

20th February, 2007.

Note: Issue C.C. in one week.

B/o
kdl

^[1] AIR 2005 SC 3401 = (2005) 12 SCC 77